

## Argument and Remarks

I am providing the argument and remarks below in response to the USPTO communication dated 06/04/2009 from Examiner Michael Lee in support of the uniqueness of the present invention and the differences between the present invention and the Stevens and Graczyk systems. The argument is reflected in the enclosed Corrected Amendments to Claims. Argument drawing 1a depicts the flow of the television signal from the originating position at the television station 1, next to the television signal receiver for the television 2, then to the television screen 3, and then to the view 4.

Regarding my invention claims 1, 2 and 4 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Stevens (6,018,339) in view of Graczyk et al. (5,192,999),

Stevens' disclosure of an automatic visual correction system for a computer showing a video signal being modified based on a user's prescription has been deleted from the claims of the present invention. The distinction between the present invention (prescription television signal originating at the television station and between the station and the television signal receiver) and the Stevens system (signal modification and computer screen) are depicted in Argument Figure 1.b. This information is reflected in the adjusted claims. This information also addresses the Graczyk system in that the television signal circuit receiver information has been removed from the present claims and is depicted in Argument Drawing 1.b. This information is also reflected in the adjusted claims. This information, too, addresses the USPTO communication regarding present invention claim 2 and the prescription for each user being fixed and also addresses the present invention claim 4 regarding Stevens being not directly attached to a television. The present invention including claims has been adjusted to reflect the disclosure of the modified video signal for a television signal which is transmitted from a television station.


Regarding my invention claims 5-9 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens (6,018,339) in view of Naiff (5,962,363),

Stevens' disclosure of an automatic visual correction system for a computer screen showing a video signal being modified based on a user's prescription has been removed from the present invention. This information is reflected in the adjusted claims and is depicted in Argument Drawing 1.b. The present invention including claims has been adjusted to reflect the disclosure of the modified video signal for a television signal which is transmitted from a television station. The information regarding Naiff's transmitting a television signal to a remote television receiver has also been deleted from the present invention. This information is reflected in the adjusted claims and depicted in Argument Drawing 1.b.


The uniqueness in the present invention as described above also address the USPTO information regarding present invention claim 7 and the automatic visual correction system being attached to the television receiver on the personal computer. Argument Drawing 1.c depicts the present invention positioned or attached on the television and located between the television station and signal receiver including the use of the prescription signal 'modifier' also positioned between the television station and the signal receiver.

I have also addressed the USPTO information regarding my argument that Stevens does not disclose that the image enhancing operation is performed at the television receiver or at the television station in that the present invention has deleted information regarding 'at the television receiver'. This is depicted in Argument Drawings 1.b and 1.c.

Argument Drawing 1a. Television signal flow components concerning the originating signal at the television station 1, then to the television signal receiver 2, then to the television screen 3 and then to the viewer 4..



Argument Drawing 1b. Television signal flow components concerning the present invention and specific location of present invention claims and the Stevens and Graczyk systems in the flow relative to the present invention.



Argument Drawing 1c. Depiction of claimed device positioned on the television and also located between the originating television signal (tv station) and the television signal receiver.

